

**From:** [Coleman, Sam](#)  
**To:** [Kelly, Albert](#)  
**Cc:** [Bowman, Liz](#); [Falvo, Nicholas](#); [Gray, David](#); [Graham, Amy](#); [Grantham, Nancy](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Any additional updates on status of review of Superfund sites DEADLINE Friday?  
**Date:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 7:47:06 PM

---

All that Kell said is correct. What I would add: Sites listed as "superfund" are those sites on the National Priorities list. Without actually seeing the list she is referring to, I can't speculate on any perceptions information that may not be properly characterized. The two counties added (actually one County and one Parish) had one additional site each for Texas and Louisiana respectively.

All 14 sites in TX have been visited. Our expert staff agree that all sites are secure and no contamination associated with the site was released. We collaborate with TCEQ to review both the State sites and the Federal sites. No issues have been observed.

The PRP is working to effect minor repairs to the rock covering the cap at San Jacinto Waste Pits Site. PRP Crews are also surveying the portion that is perpetually underwater. We completed the same protocol on previous flooding events and further collected samples the demonstrated that there have not been any releases.

We have teams that are collecting confirmation samples at the Federal Sites beginning this week.

Samuel Coleman, P. E.,  
Deputy Regional Administrator

214.665.2100 Ofc  
214.665. 3110 Desk  
214.665.2016 Cell

[Coleman.sam@epa.gov](mailto:Coleman.sam@epa.gov)

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 7, 2017, at 6:52 PM, Kelly, Albert <[kelly.albert@epa.gov](mailto:kelly.albert@epa.gov)> wrote:

First of all, there are now 43 sites not 41. This is because 2 counties have been added to the disaster declaration area and they each had one site each.

Second, these 43 are all of the NPL sites in the area. State sites are just that state sites. They are not ours nor are they our responsibility.

All sites have been visually inspected. We have testing being performed on some of these sites not because we think there is a problem but because we want to remove the fear of the unknown the press has tried to create. The visual inspections of all sites show all to be well.

I have copied Sam Coleman on this so that he can add to what I have answered.

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 7, 2017, at 9:36 AM, Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)> wrote:

Nick – Can you help us understand what she is referring to here?

Thank you - Liz

---

**From:** Olsen, Lise [<mailto:Lise.Olsen@chron.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 7, 2017 10:27 AM

**To:** Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Gray, David <[gray.david@epa.gov](mailto:gray.david@epa.gov)>; Graham, Amy <[graham.amy@epa.gov](mailto:graham.amy@epa.gov)>; Grantham, Nancy <[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov](mailto:Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Any additional updates on status of review of Superfund sites  
DEADLINE Friday?

Hello -

I wonder if you can tell me if the 41 sites listed by the EPA include only FEDERAL superfund sites in the counties affected by Hurricane Harvey. Based on information on the EPA's website, it appears there are about 100 sites, including state sites. Is that correct?

What's the latest update on the 13 sites on the EPA's list for a preliminary visual inspection? How many have been reviewed so far?

<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-data-and-reports>

[Superfund Data and Reports | US EPA](#)

[www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov)

reports and products offered here contain information on the assessment and remediation of current and archived hazardous waste sites.

---

Lise Olsen  
Investigative Reporter  
The Houston Chronicle  
[lise.olsen@chron.com](mailto:lise.olsen@chron.com)  
713-362-7462  
@chondigger

---

**From:** Bowman, Liz <[Bowman.Liz@epa.gov](mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 31, 2017 8:47 PM

**Cc:** Gray, David; Graham, Amy; Grantham, Nancy

**Subject:** EPA/TCEQ Statement on Additional Fires at Crosby Facility

## EPA/TCEQ STATEMENT ON RISK OF ADDITIONAL FIRES AT ARKEMA FACILITY IN CROSBY, TX

WASHINGTON – The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) released the following statement with regard to additional chemical fires expected in the near future at the Arkema facility in Crosby, Texas:

“It is the understanding of personnel on the ground that the remaining eight trailers holding chemicals at Arkema’s facility in Crosby, Texas are at risk of catching fire over the next few days. The refrigeration units have been compromised due to the massive flooding and therefore we expect these containers to catch fire similar to the way the first trailer did last night.

“First responders are outside the evacuation zone, but in remain the area, for quick response to ensure the safety of the community around the facility. After assessing the situation, local, state and federal response managers concluded that the safest course of action was to allow the remaining containers to catch fire, rather than try to send people to move them or put firefighters and first responders directly in harm’s way.

“We continue to monitor smoke and air quality; the potential for additional fires in the area; and, have aerial assets ready to be deployed, as needed. Everyone in the area should follow the safety instruction of local authorities, specifically staying out of the evacuation zone, avoiding smoke and flood waters.”

### Additional Background:

As with all smoke, people can limit the potential for adverse health effects by limiting their exposure. This includes staying indoors with doors and windows closed and running the air conditioning (if possible) with the fresh intake closed. If it is absolutely necessary to

be outdoors, try to move out of the plume of smoke and minimize heavy work, exercise, or children's playtime.

Today, one of nine refrigerated trailers of organic peroxide caught fire at the Arkema facility in Crosby, Texas. Following this fire, EPA sent aerial surveillance aircraft to test resulting smoke and did ground-level air quality monitoring. EPA's plane instrumentation is capable of measuring 78 different chemicals, including peroxides. Neither testing methods found toxic concentration levels in areas away from the evacuated facility.

Local officials are maintaining a 1.5-mile area of evacuation to assure that the public is protected. Air monitoring has confirmed that this is sufficient based on current conditions and anticipated events.

EPA and TCEQ are providing direct support to Michael Sims, Incident Commander, Crosby Volunteer Fire Department and Chief Bob Royall, of the Harris County Fire Marshal's Office who are leading a coordinated local, state and federal effort as part of the Unified Command to control the fire at the Arkema facility in Crosby, Texas.

###